

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMEN' United States Patent and Traden Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PA' P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFI MATION NO. 0100/0134 5102 09/940,419 08/29/2001 Timothy Bateman

7590

07/22/2004

Louis Woo LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO 1901 North Fort Myer Drive Suite 501 Arlington, VA 22209

EXAMINER

MITCHELL, TEENA KAY

PAPER NUMBER

ART UNIT 3743

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			MAN
Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	NO CO
	09/940,419	BATEMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Teena Mitchell	3743	<u> </u>
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 28 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Applexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this app (1) a timely filed amendment w	olication. A proper re which places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		•
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of externation of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF That on which the petition under 37 CFR ension and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set	e of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION.  1.136(a) and the appropriate the fee. The appropriate exing the final Office action; or	See MPEP te extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search	n (see NOTE below);	:
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n in better form for appeal by m	aterially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number o	of finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woul canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request f application in condition for allowance because:		nsidered but does N	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLEL	Y to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims versions.			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: 4			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,5,6,10 and 11</u> .			: :
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>7-9,13</u> .			:
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	oproved or b) disapproved b	y the Examiner.	:
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem			
10. Other:			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/940,419

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The claimed combination, with the new limitation of the nose blocked by adhesion of said flexible adhesive sheet member around the nose and the mouth, would constitute further search and consideration. Applicant argues, that the limitations now in claim 1 are presented in claim 10, however the examiner disagrees with this, as the claimed limitations now in claim 1 are not the same combination presented in claim 10. Furthermore, the examiner points out that there is no structural limitations in claim 1 that define over the flexible sheet of Davidson; applicant relys on adapted to language, which does not read over Davidson. Davidson discloses a flexible adhesive sheet member adapted to seal around the mouth and nose of a user.

Henry Bennett Supervisory Patent Examiner

(xroup 3700)